

REMARKS

Claims 1-74 remain pending in this application. The allowance of claims 1-73 is acknowledged with appreciation. Further reconsideration of this application is requested.

Rejection of Claim 74 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The rejection of claim 74 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Marley, U.S. Patent No. 4,181,813, is respectfully traversed.

In contrast to claim 74, Marley fails to teach a method of speech recognition by extracting transnemes from a voice stream signal and converting the transnemes to speech units. Instead, Marley discloses processing a speech waveform to detect phonemes. See, e.g., col. 5, ll. 55-58.

It is respectfully submitted that the Office action has confused Marley's method of detecting phonemes by measuring slope transitions of a speech waveform, with the teaching of the present invention wherein transnemes, or transitions between phonemes, are detected in a speech waveform and converted into speech units.

The transitions between major slopes of a speech waveform, as shown by Marley in Fig. 7 as pulses A, B, and C, do not correspond to transnemes or transitions between phonemes as defined in the present application and claimed in claim 74. Rather, the slope transitions are used by Marley to compute characteristic ratios, which ratios are then used to identify phonemes contained therein. See col. 11, ll. 56-62; col. 12, ll. 34-40; col. 13, ll. 4-6 and 25-29. Since the characteristic ratios correspond to phonemes, and the characteristic ratios are defined by the transitions in slope of the speech waveform, it follows that the slope transitions in the speech waveform in fact occur within the phonemes and thus do not and cannot represent transnemes or transitions between phonemes, as defined and claimed in the present application.

Notwithstanding the above arguments, claim 74 has been amended to be more consistent with allowed claim 73 and thus even more explicitly distinguish over the phoneme-based speech recognition method of Marley. Entry of this amendment is proper as it seeks merely to make claim 74 more consistent with the allowed claims,

and thus does not add matter that would require further search or consideration on the part of the Examiner.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-74 are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the prior art of record, whether considered individually or in combination. Favorable reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all outstanding grounds of rejection and objection, and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Please charge any fee or credit any overpayment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,					
NAME AND REG. NUMBER	Vincent M. DeLuca Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 32,408				
SIGNATURE	Vincent M DeLuca		DATE	21 SEP 04	
Address	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck 1425 K Street, N.W., Suite 800				
City	Washington	State	D.C.	Zip Code	20005
Country	U.S.A.	Telephone	202-783-6040	Fax	202-783-6031